

REMARKS

Claims 13-38 remain in the present application. Claims 1-12 are cancelled herein. Claims 13-38 are added herein. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim additions. Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

Claim Objections

Claim 12 is objected to as being allegedly improper. Claim 12 is cancelled herein, and as such, Applicant respectfully submits that a discussion of this objection is moot.

Claims 1 and 2 are objected to for the use of the word "localised." Claims 1 and 2 are cancelled herein, and as such, Applicant respectfully submits that a discussion of these objections is moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1 is cancelled herein, and as such, Applicant respectfully submits that a discussion of this rejection is moot.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claim 2 is cancelled herein, and as such, Applicant respectfully submits that a discussion of this rejection is moot.

Drawing Objections

Figure 2 is objected to as the blocks allegedly do not comprise labels. Applicant respectfully disagrees, as each block comprises a respective letter label (e.g., "A," "B," etc.). Nonetheless, a new drawing sheet is provided herein with descriptive text for each block. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added as a result of this drawing amendment.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Number 6,388,648 to Clifton et al. (hereafter referred to as "Clifton") in view of United States Patent Number 6,215,538 to Narutaki et al. (hereafter referred to as "Narutaki"). Claims 1-12 are cancelled herein, and thus, Applicant respectfully submits that a discussion of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of Claims 1-12 is moot.

Newly-Added Claims 13-38

Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to independent Claim 13 that recites a method of controlling a multi-component display comprising (emphasis added):

accessing graphical data for displaying an image on a first display screen of said multi-component display, said multi-component display further comprising a second display screen, wherein said first and second display screens overlap, and wherein said first and second display screens are each operable to display graphical objects;

determining an image characteristic associated with a presentation of said image; and

determining a transmissivity of a region of said second display screen for implementing said image characteristic associated with said presentation of said image, wherein said region comprises a portion of said second display screen and corresponds to said image displayed on said first display screen.

Independent Claim 20 recites limitations similar to independent Claim 13. Claims 14-19 and 21-25 depend from their respective independent Claims and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that Clifton fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "a first display screen of said multi-component display," "said multi-component display further comprising a second display screen" and "wherein said first and second display screens overlap" as recited in independent Claim 13, and similarly recited in independent Claim 20. As recited and described in the present application, a multi-component display comprises a first and second display screen. Additionally, the first and second display screens overlap (e.g., see Figure 1 of the present application).

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicant fails to find any teaching or suggestion in Clifton of a multi-component display comprising multiple display screens which overlap as claimed. Further, Applicant understands Clifton to teach multiple display screens 12A-12N arranged in a side-by-side array *without* overlap as shown in Figure 2 of Clifton. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Clifton teaches away from the claimed embodiments.

Applicant respectfully submits that Narutaki, either alone or in combination with Clifton, also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "a first display screen of said multi-component display," "said multi-component display further comprising a second display screen" and "wherein said first and second display screens overlap" as recited in independent Claim 13, and similarly recited in independent Claim 20. For example, Applicant fails to find any teaching or

suggestion in Clifton of a multi-component display comprising multiple display screens which overlap as claimed. Further, Applicant understands Narutaki to teach a *single* reflective LCD as shown in Figure 1B of Narutaki instead of multiple overlapping display screens as claimed. As such, Applicant reiterates that Narutaki fails to teach or suggest a multi-component display comprising overlapping display screens as claimed.

Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to independent Claim 26 that recites a method of controlling a multi-component display comprising (emphasis added):

accessing graphical data for displaying an image on a display screen of said multi-component display, said multi-component display further comprising a non-display layer, wherein said display screen and said non-display layer overlap;
determining an image characteristic associated with a presentation of said image;
determining a transmissivity of a region of said non-display layer for implementing said image characteristic associated with said presentation of said image, wherein said region comprises a portion of said non-display layer and corresponds to said image displayed on said display screen.

Independent Claim 33 recites limitations similar to independent Claim 26.

Claims 27-32 and 34-38 depend from their respective independent Claims and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully submit that Clifton fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "a display screen of said multi-component display," "said multi-component display further comprising a non-display layer" and "wherein said display screen and said non-display layer overlap" as recited in independent Claim 26, and similarly recited in independent Claim 33. As recited and described in the present application, a multi-component display comprises a display screen and a non-display layer. The non-display layer may be operable to adjust its transmissivity (e.g., for filtering or otherwise altering an image

displayed on the display screen and thereby implementing presentation of the image with an image characteristic such as brightness, contrast, color, etc.) without displaying an image (see lines 18-23 of page 11 of the present application). Additionally, the display screen and the non-display layer overlap (e.g., see Figure 1 of the present application).

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicant fail to find any teaching or suggestion in Clifton of a multi-component display comprising a display screen and a non-display layer which overlap as claimed. Further, as discussed above, Applicant understands Clifton to teach multiple display screens 12A-12N arranged in a side-by-side array *without* overlap as shown in Figure 2 of Clifton. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Clifton teaches away from the claimed embodiments.

Applicant respectfully submits that Narutaki, either alone or in combination with Clifton, also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "a display screen of said multi-component display," "said multi-component display further comprising a non-display layer" and "wherein said display screen and said non-display layer overlap" as recited in independent Claim 26, and similarly recited in independent Claim 33. For example, Applicant fails to find any teaching or suggestion in Clifton of a multi-component display comprising a display screen and a non-display layer which overlap as claimed. Further, Applicant understands Narutaki to teach a *single* reflective LCD as shown in Figure 1B of Narutaki instead of a display screen *and* a non-display layer as claimed. As such, Applicant reiterates that Narutaki fails to teach or suggest a multi-component display comprising a display screen and a non-display layer, where the display screen and non-display layer overlap, as claimed.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 13, 20, 26 and 33 are not rendered obvious by Clifton in view of Narutaki. Since dependent Claims 14-19, 21-25, 27-32 and 34-38 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Claims 14-19, 21-25, 27-32 and 34-38 are also not rendered obvious by Clifton in view of Narutaki. Therefore, Claims 13-38 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 13-38 are in condition for allowance and Applicant earnestly solicits such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 1/10, 2008

Bmf

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060